



***Environmental
Planning
Commission***

***Agenda Number: 14
Project Number: 1004976
Case #s: 06EPC 00424/00425
September 21, 2006***

Staff Report

<i>Agent</i>	H. Barker Architects
<i>Applicant</i>	Calabacillas Group
<i>Requests</i>	Site Development Plan for Subdivision Site Development Plan for Building Permit
<i>Legal Description</i>	Tracts A-1, B-1 and C-1, Black Arroyo Dam Addition
<i>Location</i>	SW corner of Golf Course Rd. NW and Westside Blvd. (10,851 Golf Course Rd. NW)
<i>Size</i>	Approximately 15 acres
<i>Existing Zoning</i>	C-2 (SC)
<i>Proposed Zoning</i>	Same

Staff Recommendation

***APPROVAL of 06EPC 00424 based on
the findings beginning on page 15 and the
conditions of approval on page 17.***

***APPROVAL of 06EPC 00425 based on
the findings beginning on page 20 and
subject to the conditions of approval
beginning on page 22.***

Staff Planner

Catalina Lehner, AICP-Planner

Summary of Analysis

This request is for a site development plan for subdivision and a site development plan for building permit for Tracts A-1, B-1 and C-1, Black Arroyo Dam Addition, approx. 15 acres. The applicant requested a 30-day deferral in July and August.

The applicant proposes to create Tract F-1 and construct a 475 unit self-storage facility. Design standards are also proposed. This shopping center site is located in the Golf Course/County Line Neighborhood Activity Center. There is some neighborhood concern.

Staff recommends approval subject to conditions, which will improve compliance with applicable policies in the Comprehensive Plan and the West Side Strategic Plan.

City Departments and other interested agencies reviewed this application from 6/5/06 to 6/16/06.
Agency comments used in the preparation of this report begin on Page 26.

AREA CHARACTERISTICS AND ZONING HISTORY

Surrounding zoning, plan designations, and land uses:

	<i>Zoning</i>	<i>Comprehensive Plan Area; Applicable Rank II & III Plans</i>	<i>Land Use</i>
<i>Site</i>	C-2 (SC)	Established Urban West Side Strategic Plan	Vacant
<i>North</i>	C-2 (SC)	Established Urban West Side Strategic Plan	Westside Blvd. alignment, then City of Rio Rancho, (vacant land, auto care and a doctor office)
<i>South</i>	C-2 (SC)	Established Urban West Side Strategic Plan	Vacant-Black Arroyo Detention Basin, then single-family homes
<i>East</i>	C-2 (SC)	Established Urban West Side Strategic Plan	Vacant, then single-family homes
<i>West</i>	C-2 (SC)	Established Urban West Side Strategic Plan	Vacant-Black Arroyo Detention Basins

Request & Context

This request is for a site development plan for subdivision and a site development plan for building permit for Tracts A-1, B-1 and C-1, Black Arroyo Dam Addition, approximately 15 acres (the “subject site”). The applicant proposes to create a fourth tract (Tract F-1) and construct a 475 unit self-storage facility with a caretaker residence on it. Development on Tracts A-1, B-1 and C-1 is not a part of this proposal, though design standards are included that will guide development on Tract F-1 and future development on the other tracts.

The subject site consists of three tracts located on the southwestern corner of the Golf Course Road/Westside Boulevard intersection. Westside Boulevard is being extended westward and is not yet paved. North of the subject site is the City of Rio Rancho, with more vacant land, some commercial uses and the Cabezon subdivision under construction. Across Golf Course Road to the east are Tracts D and E, which are vacant. To the south and west is Albuquerque Metropolitan Area Flood Control Authority (AMAFCA) land that comprises the Black Arroyo Detention Basin. South of the subject site are single family homes in the Horizon Hills subdivision.

History & Background

The subject site was annexed in 1985 (Enactment 37-1985) as part of a 10,136 acre annexation of land in the Paradise Hills area of northwest Albuquerque (AX-85-20, Z-85-84). Some of this area, including the subject site (consisting of Tracts A-1, B-1 and C-1), was part of the Paradise Hills Master Plan. The subject site's zoning was established as SU-1 for C-1. Along with Tracts D and E, in 1987 the subject site's zoning was changed to C-2 (Z-87-20). The subject site is a shopping center by definition, which makes its zoning C-2 (SC).

In 1998, the EPC approved minimal design standards for Tracts D and E, which are across Golf Course Road from the subject site (Z-98-19, Z-97-88). Similar design standards are proposed with the current request. In July 2003, the EPC approved amendments to the 1998 design standards (Project #1002556). Tracts D and E remain vacant, though a recent request for dwelling units as a conditional use was withdrawn.

Design Standards

The purpose of design standards is to provide guidance for a development in order to ensure that the development will be a high quality that exceeds minimum Zoning Code requirements, furthers the intent of applicable City Plans and policies and contributes to making planning goals a reality. The proposed site plan for subdivision needs to serve as an overarching guide for development so that applicable policies in the Comprehensive Plan and the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) are furthered.

Definitions (Zoning Code §14-16-1-5)

Shopping Center Site: A premises containing five or more acres; zoned P, C-1, C-2, C-3, M-1, M-2 or a combination thereof; but excluding premises used and proposed to be used only for manufacturing, assembling, treating, repairing rebuilding, wholesaling, and warehousing.

Site Development Plan for Subdivision: An accurate plan at a scale of at least 1 inch to 100 feet which covers at least one lot and specifies the site, proposed use, pedestrian and vehicular ingress and egress, any internal circulation requirements and, for each lot, maximum building height, minimum building setback, and maximum total dwelling units and/or nonresidential uses' maximum floor area ratio.

Zoning

The subject site is zoned C-2 (SC). The C-2 Community Commercial zone "provides suitable sites for offices, for most service and commercial activities, and for certain specified institutional uses." Uses are permissive in C-2 "provided there is no outdoor storage except parking." Therefore, the "transfer or storage of household goods", meaning self-storage uses, is a conditional use in the C-2 zone.

In Fall 2005, the applicant applied for a conditional use for storage units on Tracts A-1, B-1 and C-1, but did not provide all the information that the Zoning Hearing Examiner (ZHE) requested. Therefore, the final approval was not granted. The applicant returned to the ZHE on July 18, 2006 to complete the process. This time the ZHE placed the case on indefinite deferral pending resolution of the access issue

at Westside Blvd., which was of great concern to the applicant. However, the access issue has since been resolved. The applicant needs to coordinate with the ZHE office so this process can be completed. **As of this writing, however, the conditional use permit for the storage units has not been finalized.** (The ZHE needs 15 days to finalize a case).

The subject site is a shopping center by definition (see above) and therefore has a shopping center (SC) designation. Shopping center regulations applicable to the current request are found in Zoning Code §14-16-3-2.

Long Range Roadway System

The Long Range Roadway System (LRRS) map, produced by the Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG), identifies the functional classifications of roadways. Golf Course Road is a minor arterial, with an 86-foot right-of-way. Westside Blvd. is also a minor arterial, with an 86-foot right-of-way, east of Golf Course Rd. West of Golf Course Road, Westside Blvd. is a local street and has not been developed as of this writing. Though Westside Blvd. is a limited-access roadway, the applicant was able to obtain access onto Westside Blvd. (see attachment) near the subject site's northwestern corner.

Public Facilities/Community Services

Transit: No Albuquerque Ride routes presently serve the subject site.

Police: The Shawn McWethy Substation, at 6404 Los Volcanes NW, provides police coverage.

Fire: A fire station is located on Ellison Drive, about 1.5 miles southeast of the subject site.

ANALYSIS -CONFORMANCE TO ADOPTED PLANS AND POLICIES

1) Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan- Rank I

The subject site is located in an area that the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan has designated Established Urban. The Comprehensive Plan goal of Developing and Established Urban Areas is "to create a quality urban environment which perpetuates the tradition of identifiable, individual but integrated communities within the metropolitan area and which offers variety and maximum choice in housing, transportation, work areas and life styles, while creating a visually pleasing built environment." Applicable policies include:

Policy II.B.5a: The Developing Urban and Established Urban areas as shown by the Plan map shall allow a full range of urban land uses, resulting in an overall gross density up to 5 dwelling units per acre.

Policy II.B.5d: The location, intensity and design of new development shall respect existing neighborhood values, natural environmental conditions and carrying capacities, scenic resources, and resources of other social, cultural, recreational concern.

Policy II.B.5e: New growth shall be accommodated through development in areas where vacant land is contiguous to existing or programmed urban facilities and services and where the integrity of existing neighborhoods can be ensured.

Policy II.B.5i: Employment and service uses shall be located to complement residential areas and shall be sited to minimize adverse effects of noise, lighting, pollution, and traffic on residential environments.

Policy II.B.5j: Where new commercial development occurs, it should generally be located in existing commercially zoned areas as follows:

- In small neighborhood-oriented centers provided with pedestrian and bicycle access within reasonable distance of residential areas for walking or bicycling.
- In larger area-wide shopping centers located at intersections of arterial streets and provided with access via mass transit; more than one shopping center should be allowed at an intersection only when transportation problems do not result.
- In freestanding retailing and contiguous storefronts along streets in older neighborhoods.

Policy II.B.5l: Quality and innovation in design shall be encouraged in all new development; design shall be encouraged which is appropriate to the plan area.

Policy II.B.5m: Urban and site design which maintains and enhances unique vistas and improves the quality of the visual environment shall be encouraged.

The proposed development would be located in a mostly residential area that has some land use variety. To the south are single-family homes. To the west is Golf Course Road and vacant Tracts D and E zoned C-2 (SC). North is Westside Blvd. and vacant land in the City of Rio Rancho. Just past the border are a doctor office, an auto care use and single-family homes. The proposal will bring a new commercial uses to the area and therefore further Policy II.B.5a-full range of urban land uses. The proposal also further Policy II.B.5e-programmed facilities/neighborhood integrity. The use of existing urban services is unlikely to disrupt existing neighborhoods.

The proposal partially further Policy II.B.5i-employment/service use location. Though the Black Arroyo Detention Basin creates distance between the proposed development and existing residential areas, the proposed design standards do not adequately address future uses or lighting. The effects of traffic are unknown because the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) is incomplete. The proposal partially further Policy II.B.5l-design quality/innovation, which calls for new development to be designed appropriately for the Plan area. The long expanses of monotonous metal storage units are a non-innovative utilitarian design, but the location at the back of the shopping center will help to minimize its impact. The Territorial style caretaker's residence, however, is nicely designed and appropriate for the Plan area, though the brown metal wall detracts from its quality.

The proposal partially further Policy II.B.5j-general location of new commercial development. Though the subject site is commercially zoned, storage units undermine the intent of this policy because they are not the type of every day use envisioned for this neighborhood activity center. The design standards do not adequately address pedestrian and bicycle access for this neighborhood activity center, which is supposed to play a role in neighborhood centers.

The proposal does not further Policy II.B.5d-neighborhood values/natural environmental conditions, which the location, design and intensity of new development must respect. Neighbors on the bluff value their views, which they feel the proposed development will negatively impact. All neighbors want a quality development, but the proposed design standards do not ensure this even though the storage units will be located at the back of the shopping center. The proposal does not further Policy II.B.5m-site design/visual environment. The proposed storage units do not improve the quality of the visual environment and the design standards do not ensure a uniform architecture and theme.

2) West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP)- Rank II

The West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) was first adopted in 1997 and recently amended in 2002 to help promote development of Neighborhood and Community Activity Centers. The WSSP identifies 13 communities, each with a unique identity and comprised of smaller neighborhood clusters. The subject site is located in the Seven Bar Ranch community, which consists of the following area between: the Calabacillas Arroyo to the south and the County line to the north, and the Rio Grande to the east and approximately Rainbow Blvd. to the west. Policies particular to the Seven Bar Ranch Community mostly address development of the Regional Center near Cottonwood Mall.

A) Policies

Policy 1.1: Thirteen distinct communities, as shown on the Community Plan Map and described individually in this Plan, shall constitute the existing and future urban form of the West Side. Communities shall develop with areas of higher density (in Community and Neighborhood Centers), surrounded by areas of lower density. Bernalillo County and the City of Albuquerque Planning Commissions shall require that high density and non-residential development occur within Community and Neighborhood Centers. Low density residential development (typical 3-5 du/acre subdivisions, or large lot rural subdivisions) shall not be approved within the Centers.

Policy 1.15: Neighborhood Centers of 15 to 35 acres shall contain generally small parcels and buildings; on-street parking is permitted, with smaller off-street parking areas shared among businesses and institutions. The neighborhood center shall have a built scale very accommodating to pedestrians and bicyclists, including outdoor seating for informal gatherings. Services such as childcare, dry cleaners, drugstores, and small restaurants, along with a park and/or school should be located central to surrounding neighborhoods (p. 41).

Policy 1.16: Neighborhood Centers shall be located on local collector and sometimes arterial streets. While their primary access may be by auto, pedestrian and bicycle connections shall be provided to all adjacent neighborhoods, parks, and to the larger open space system. Convenient transit services shall be connected with community-wide and regional transit development (p. 41).

Policy 3.4 (Seven Bar Ranch): Several clusters of neighborhoods will develop within the Seven Bar Ranch Community. Each of these shall be served by a Neighborhood Center, so neighborhood commercial, public and quasi-public uses and other uses appropriate for such Centers shall be

encouraged. The lowest density single-family residential development shall not occur within these Centers, but must have safe pedestrian and bicycle access to them (p. 51).

Policy 4.6: The following design guidelines (pages 160-171 of the Plan) shall become policies with the approval of this Plan: View Preservation; Views East of Coors Boulevard; Views to and from the Monument; *Other Views* (emphasis mine); Height; Lighting; Vegetation; Overhead Utilities; Radio, TV, and Cellular Towers; Signs; Fences and Walls; and Additional Design Guideline Issues. It is recognized that additional Design Guidelines based on these and other applicable policies of the Plan shall be developed as follow-up work, and will be more complete than those included here. These policies were considered too critical to wait for additional planning efforts in the future.

WSSP Policy 1.1 requires that high density and non-residential development occur within Community and Neighborhood Centers. The subject site is located in the Golf Course/County Line Neighborhood Center (p. 141). However, Staff finds that the proposal partially furthers the intent of WSSP Policy 1.1. The WSSP intends Neighborhood Centers to provide daily goods and services for people within about a 1 mile radius (p. 36). Neighborhood Center uses must be connected for bicycles and pedestrians, which the design standards do not address. The storage units are not the “daily” types of services that cater to neighbors within a mile radius; rather, storage units are infrequented, auto-dominated and not a part of the small-scale neighborhood activity the WSSP envisions.

For these same reasons, the proposal does not further WSSP Policy 3.4, which says that neighborhoods will be served by neighborhood centers with appropriate uses that provide daily goods and services. Staff recognizes that the subject site is zoned C-2 and that the WSSP does not intend to change existing zoning. However, Staff believes that C-2 permissive uses can still be considered neighborhood-serving, where as storage units are a more intense, conditional use.

The proposal does not further WSSP Policies 1.15 and 1.16 regarding Neighborhood Centers. The storage units do not foster a “built scale very accommodating to pedestrians and bicyclists”. The site plan for subdivision does not adequately address pedestrians and bicyclists; nor does it integrate pedestrian friendly elements into future site design (Policy 1.15). Specifically, the site plan for subdivision does not discuss how this shopping center site will be connected to “all adjacent neighborhoods, parks, and to the larger open space system”.

WSSP design guidelines apply to views, which the neighbors on the bluff are concerned about preserving or at least mitigating the development’s effect upon. WSSP p. 160 states that “views of ...the expanses of the far west mesa must all be preserved to the greatest extent possible.” The proposed development will adversely affect the view from the bluff for residents, park users and trail users. The proposal does not address the concern about views and proposes visual elements, such as chain link fencing and high walls, that will worsen views in the area. Therefore, the proposal does not further the intent of WSSP Policy 4.6-design guidelines, other views.

B) Westside-McMahon Land Use and Transportation Guide (Enactment 117-1999)*

**included in the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP)*

In November 1999, the City Council adopted Enactment No. 117-1999 as an amendment to the WSSP. This Enactment incorporated the Westside-McMahon Land Use and Transportation Guide, which was synthesized into policies and a map (Attachment A) and is contained in the Enactment. The concepts identified therein identify an arrangement of mixed land uses and “establish a desirable direction for promoting the opportunity for reduced automobile travel and encourage the use of transit, bicycle and pedestrian modes”.

The subject site falls within the boundaries of Enactment No. 117-1999. Note the following found in Section 4: “The map included as Attachment A, Transportation and Land Use Concept for the Westside-McMahon Corridor, and the performance measures listed below establish the policies that will be used by the EPC and the City Council in their review of development and rezoning proposals for properties located within the Westside-McMahon corridor”. The following policies apply:

Section 3: The land use concepts set forth herein are not intended to imply zoning or supersede existing zoning and/or development plans.

Section 4(A): Such proposals should be generally consistent with density, type and hierarchy of uses as illustrated in Attachment A (which designates the subject site as Low Commercial).

Section 4(A)(2): Low Commercial includes neighborhood scale commercial development *as allowed under the C-1 zone category* of the City of Albuquerque Comprehensive Zoning Code (emphasis mine).

Section 4(A)(3): Medium Commercial includes community scale commercial development *as allowed under the C-2 zone category* of the City of Albuquerque Comprehensive Zoning Code (emphasis mine).

Section 4(C): Connections that provide safe and efficient pedestrian movements to enhance mobility within the corridor and encourage the use of transit, bicycle and pedestrian modes as an alternative to automobile travel should be provided between adjoining uses and between developments and the transportation system.”

The Westside-McMahon Land Use and Transportation Guide (the Guide) designates the subject site “Low Commercial”. The WSSP envisions C-1 neighborhood commercial uses, which are most appropriate for this location in the Golf Course/County Line neighborhood activity center. The “Medium Commercial” category, designated appropriate for C-2 uses, is found along NM 528. The proposal conflicts with Sections 4(A)(2) and 4(A)(3) of Enactment 117-1999. However, Section 3 indicates that the Guide does not supersede existing zoning. The subject site is already zoned for C-2 uses and self-storage units are a conditional use in the C-2 zone.

Attachment A shows a bicycle/pedestrian facility along Westside Blvd. and along Golf Course Rd. (the north and east sides of the subject site). The proposed site plan for subdivision includes neither and does not have sufficiently address non-auto travel and therefore does not comply with Section 4(C) of Enactment 117-1999.

ANALYSIS--SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION & SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR BUILDING PERMIT

Discussed here are: 1) the site plan for subdivision, which proposes design standards for this shopping center site and proposes to create a new Tract F-1, and 2) the site plan for building permit for the proposed storage units and caretaker residence on Tract F-1.

Because the storage units are utilitarian buildings, Staff recognizes that they do not per se serve as an example that sets the tone for other buildings in the shopping center. However, design standards are proposed that will guide future development of this shopping center site located in the Golf Course/County Line Neighborhood Activity Center. Because of the current request's nature and location in back of the shopping center, Staff believes that the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) should review subsequent development requests as the subject site's SC designation calls for. Delegation to the Development Review Board (DRB) is not recommended.

Zoning Code §14-16-1-5, Definitions, specifies that a site plan for subdivision shall address the following: proposed use, pedestrian and vehicular ingress and egress, internal circulation, maximum building height, minimum building setback and maximum floor area ratio (FAR). The proposed site plan for subdivision mentions FAR and does not address the other required elements.

Site Plan Layout / Configuration

1) The proposed design standards state that land uses are limited to permissive uses in the C-2, C-1 and O-1 zones. However, the site plan for building permit proposes storage units, a conditional use in C-2. Therefore, Staff suggests that the design standards specify that a conditional use is allowed for Tract F-1 *so that the site plan for building permit will comply with the site plan for subdivision.*

2) The storage units are proposed for Tract F-1, at the back of the subject site. There is a caretaker residence near the entrance and four long expanses of buildings containing the units. Some have roll-up doors (sizes C-G) and the other, smaller units (sizes A and B) are internally accessed. The northern end of the subject site is reserved for Phase II future development. A site plan note needs to be added to explain the intentions for the second development phase.

Refuse Enclosure: The dumpster proposed near the south side of the subject site, near the caretaker residence. The height and material of the enclosure walls need to be indicated.

Walls/Fences

1) No design standards for walls and fences are proposed. Language needs to be added to address finishes, types of walls/fencing and screening. Staff suggests the prohibition of barbed wire, concertina wire, chain link fencing and unfinished CMU block.

2) A 9 ft. 4 in. CMU wall will surround Tract F-1, except for a small portion near the entrance that will be 8 ft. tall and consist of block with a steel fence on top. Such a tall wall creates a "fortress-like" feeling as a backdrop to this shopping center. The wall will be light brown smooth-face block with two

stripes of burgundy split-faced block. Additional articulation is needed to improve the wall's quality, which will help mitigate the fortress feeling. Staff suggests pilasters every 20 ft. There is a 6 ft. corrugated metal wall (painted brown) proposed around the caretaker's residence. Staff suggests a light brown or light beige color and a different fencing material, to not detract from the appealing Territorial style residence.

A 6 ft. chain link fence is proposed to abut the Black Arroyo Dam area. Chain link is used because water can run through it and AMAFCA requires a 6 ft. drainage channel at the back of the subject site. The neighbors are concerned that chain link will detract from their views and lessen the development's quality. Staff agrees, and suggests the following: replacing the chain link fence with a tan, painted steel fence that blends with its surroundings. The steel fence can run to the building and stop, and the building can be used as a boundary-leaving the 6 ft. drainage channel and using less fencing.

Vehicular Access, Circulation & Parking

1) Zoning Code §14-16-1-5, Definitions, states that a site plan for subdivision shall specify vehicular ingress and egress and circulation. The proposed site plan for subdivision does not sufficiently address vehicular access or circulation patterns, which should relate to the subject site's functioning as a cohesive shopping center. To comply with Zoning Code §14-16-1-5, the design standards need to address how vehicles will enter, exit and circulate.

The design standards refer to parking lot lighting and landscape, but they do not include sufficient information regarding breaking up "seas of parking" and creating a shopping center that pedestrians can use. Staff recommends that pedestrian connections be provided in parking lots to create the pedestrian-friendly environment desired in Neighborhood Activity Centers. Also, the common design standard that parking "shall not exceed required plus 10%" should be included.

2) Vehicles will have two ways to access Tract F-1: from Golf Course Rd. or from Westside Blvd. Right in, right out access from Westside Blvd., a limited access roadway, was made available (see attachment) and will be mostly for emergency access via a crash-gate. The access from Golf Course Rd. will lead to the storage units' main entrance.

No parking lot is proposed. Rather, there are 5 standard parking spaces and one handicap space near the entrance. The parking is located in front of the storage units with roll up doors. Parking was calculated using Zoning Code §14-16-3-1, Off-Street Parking Regulations. For a warehouse use, the net leasable area is divided by 2,000. 31 standard spaces and 1 handicap space are required. The applicant states that 64 spaces are provided, but they are not indicated on the site plan and there is no explanatory note. If each unit with a roll-up door had a space, there would be 181 spaces, not 64. No motorcycle or bicycle parking is proposed.

A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) is required. Though the Westside Development Traffic Impact Study (TIS) has been completed, it contains deficiencies which the applicant and the City Engineer will need to work together to address. As of this writing, this coordination has begun but the effort is not completed.

Pedestrian & Bicycle Access and Circulation, Transit Access

Pedestrian & Bicycle Access and Circulation:

1) The proposed design standards do not address pedestrian and bicycle access, either internally or from Westside Blvd. and Golf Course Rd. "Transit and pedestrian amenities are to be provided by the developers of A-1, B-1 and C-1" is all they say. There is no plan for pedestrian and bicycle access. Because this is a shopping center site located in a neighborhood center, a pedestrian plan needs to be included and aim to minimize pedestrian/vehicle conflict. The narrative needs to address proposed path locations, and specify widths and materials. The existing bike lane along Golf Course Rd. is not mentioned. Nor do the design standards address bicycle access, circulation or parking.

2) Tract F-1 is located at the back of the shopping center site. Because of the storage use, pedestrian and bicycle access is less important for Tract F-1 than for the remaining (and any future) tracts. The site plan should include an explanatory note.

Transit Access:

1) The proposed design standards state that "Transit and pedestrian amenities are to be provided by the developers of A-1, B-1 and C-1". Transit access is linked to pedestrian and bicycle access, which are not addressed. Though no transit routes currently serve the subject site, in the future they may.

2) Tract F-1 is located at the back of the shopping center site. Because of the storage use, transit access is less important for Tract F-1 than for the remaining (and any future) tracts. The site plan should include an explanatory note.

Lighting

1) Parking lot lighting fixture type and height is specified. The height needs to be measured from top to grade. Fixtures will be standardized and conform to night sky standards. Staff suggests that light fixtures be fully shielded, that high-pressure sodium lighting and uplighting are prohibited.

2) The location of the proposed light poles is not indicated and a lighting detail is not provided.

Landscape Standards & Landscape Plan

1) The proposed landscape standards do not state the landscape theme. Any plants that "fit the intent of the palette", which is undefined, are allowed. Landscape in this shopping center does not ensure that a theme will be followed, especially since the intent of the palette is unspecified. The plants' size is included, but does not comply with Zoning Code §14-16-3-10 which requires that trees have a 2 in. caliper or be a minimum 10 ft. tall. The proposed landscape standards do not list water usage or allergenic potential. Two types of juniper, a high pollen producer, are included as is Arizona Ash. Crabapple and Sycamore, high water use trees, are also included. Juniper, Sycamore and Ash are prohibited pursuant to ROA § 9-12-5 (pollen control ordinance).

Staff believes that xeric plants better suited to a high desert setting are more appropriate. They will use less water and blend in better with the area's natural surroundings. Trees such as Crabapple, Sycamore,

and Bradford Pear should be replaced with trees that use less water, such as Golden Rain Tree, Chinese Pistache, Chitalpa and Mesquite. The Boxwood shrub grows best south of Socorro and likes shade. The Privet shrub is a high water user that is not fond of high deserts. Nandina is also a high water user. [Sources: Best Plants (Morrow) and The Complete How to Guide to Xericaping (COA)]. Staff recommends that hedges be made of Russian Sage and Big Sage (artemisia).

Other appropriate xeric shrubs include three-leaf sumac, Apache Plume, Curlleaf mountain mahogany, Fernbush and Desert Willow. Appropriate flowering plants, such as penstemons, Mexican evening primrose and lavender, could be included to broaden the palette. Adding xeric grasses (Threadgrass, blue gramma grass, blue fescue) and desert accent plants (hesperaloe, sotol, ocotillo) would also benefit the proposed landscape palette. The proposed landscape standards allow Red-fescue type sod. Fescues are high water users and should not be permitted for use in the shopping center. For the caretaker's residence, a small patch may be appropriate, but this needs to be explained on the site plan and not allowed for the rest of the shopping center.

2) The proposed site plan for building permit does not comply with the proposed landscape standards. Five plants (and a grass) are proposed for use on Tract F-1 that are not included in the landscape standards. Bluegrass is proposed, but Fescue is called out in the design standards. The proposed site plans need to comply with each other.

Requirements: Per Zoning Code §14-16-3-10-G, Landscaping Regulations Applicable to Apartment and Non-Residential Development, all required landscape areas 36 square feet or larger shall be covered with living, vegetative materials over at least 75% of the area. No landscape is proposed near the storage unit buildings, but there are landscape areas around the caretaker's residence and the entrance. Landscape coverage is not 75% in the areas near the entrance. Additional plant material is needed.

Grading & Drainage Plan

The subject site slopes downward from north to south. Elevations range from $\approx 5,178$ feet to $\approx 5,155$ feet, for a grade change of 23 feet. Water flows generally south toward three proposed catch basins along the subject site's southeastern side. A series of five temporary retention ponds are proposed at the northern third of the subject site, which is proposed as Phase II development. The storm drain within the site will be connected to the storm drain system of the subdivision to the south, which is adjacent to the Black Arroyo.

The subject site is located in a Flood Zone. The applicant will need to continue coordinating with the Albuquerque Metropolitan Arroyo Flood Control Authority (AMAFCA) and the City Hydrologist regarding stormwater runoff, which will be addressed at the Development Review Board (DRB).

Utilities/Utility Plan

1) The proposed design standards state that mechanical and other equipment "should" be screened. Screening of rooftop utility equipment needs to be required, as does screening of transformers and telephone boxes viewed from the public right-of-way, to mitigate the negative visual image that some utility equipment can present.

2) The utility plan shows an existing sewer line, to which the new line will connect, running north-south on Tract C-1. A new water line will connect, via a 30 foot easement, to an existing water line along Golf Course Road. Two fire hydrants are proposed.

Architecture & Design

1) The proposed architectural design standards recognize that plaza-like development and de-emphasizing signature (franchise) buildings will contribute to creating a quality shopping center. However, the design standards do not take the additional steps necessary to ensure the shopping center's cohesiveness. For instance, architectural style is defined broadly and could include almost anything. Staff recognizes the intention to not limit creativity, but allowing a loophole for franchise architecture will result in a "mish-mash" of styles and will not create a cohesive shopping center at this neighborhood center location.

2) The proposed caretaker's residence is a Territorial style home, finished in light beige stucco with white framed windows. It is a quality design featuring architectural details such as columns and red brick coping, though Staff finds that the corrugated brown aluminum backyard wall will detract from it.

The proposed storage unit buildings are 8.5 ft. high. They are made of pre-fabricated tan metal with white garage doors, which emulates the Territorial style. Buildings A and C have interior accessed units. The interior access doors are blue, which Staff suggests is specified as light blue. This may help break up the monotony of the utilitarian façades.

Signage Standards & Signs

1) The design standards propose two types of signs. There will be one multi-tenant project sign, not to exceed 75 sf sign face, at the southwest corner of Westside Blvd. and Golf Course Rd. Each tract is allowed a monument sign, not to exceed 50 sf sign face. One project sign is shown on the map, but is not explained in the narrative. Signage details are provided, but they do not match the narrative. Staff believes that the monument sign sizes are too large and will detract from the setting and overpower the pedestrian scale of development desired for Neighborhood Activity Centers. Staff recommends a 20 sf sign face area as shown in the monument sign detail. Also, 10% of the façade area is a pretty large sign; Staff recommends 8% (Bosque Plaza has 6%).

The proposed design standards do not require signage to be compatible with building architecture. However, the stucco color where the sign is mounted needs to match the building to create a cohesive look to the shopping center. Staff suggests that pole-mounted signs and signs supported with wires be prohibited.

2) The proposed project sign (meaning monument sign) for the storage units is located on the right side of its entrance. It is 31.5 sf in area, with red letters on a white background, and is mounted atop 11 ft. white posts bolstered by diagonal braces. This type of sign is inappropriate for a shopping center, because it will be very visible (rising nearly 14 ft.) and will be different than the monument signs

envisioned for the other properties. Staff suggests a monument sign to match the detail provided in the proposed design standards.

Public Outdoor Space

1) The proposed design standards mention patios and plaza-like development, but do not require it. Nor do they require that restaurants provide outdoor seating, which would help facilitate a pedestrian environment and will be an amenity for the shopping center. Per Zoning Code §14-16-3-18 (B)(4), public outdoor space must be provided with buildings that are 60,000 square feet or greater. Staff recommends provision of open space in accordance with this section.

2) The proposed site plan for building permit includes two small landscape areas on each side of the entrance, before the gates. The landscape needs to be shown and the dimensions indicated.

Concerns of Reviewing Agencies/Pre-Hearing Discussion

City departments and other interested agencies reviewed this application from 5/8/06 to 5/19/06. The applicant attended a voluntary pre-application review meeting and attended the pre-hearing discussion on May 24, 2006.

There are several agency comments. The Solid Waste Management Division (SWMD) objected that the refuse enclosure was not shown on the site plan. The Office of Neighborhood Coordination (ONC) requested that the applicant obtain an updated notification letter, which he has done. The Albuquerque Metro Arroyo Flood Control Authority (AMAFCA) commented that a private storm drain license will be required. Transportation Development commented that they recommend deferral of this project pending completion of the required Traffic Impact Study (TIS). Zone Code services commented that a conditional use approval is needed but has not yet been granted.

Neighborhood Concerns

The affected neighborhood association (NA) is the Paradise Heights NA, whom the applicant notified. The proposed development of this shopping center has generated some neighborhood concern. The Paradise Heights NA submitted a letter (see attachment) stating that they want to see a cohesive development with a uniform style of buildings, lighting and pedestrian connections.

Staff was contacted by neighbors who reside on the bluff, in the Heritage Hills subdivision south of the subject site. They are concerned that the proposed development will be unaesthetically pleasing and could be poorly constructed, and feel that views from their homes, the Black Arroyo recreational trail and the park will be adversely impacted. They want the shopping center to be designed cohesively, taking into account the integrity of the environment.

Staff was also contacted by representatives of the Stonebridge Homeowners Association (HOA), who live on the east side of Golf Course Rd. They also want to see a quality development, and are concerned that what develops on the subject site could set the tone for subsequent development of the vacant tracts east of Golf Course Rd.

Conclusion

This proposal is for a site development plan for subdivision and a site development plan for building permit for an approximately 15 acre site at the southwestern corner of Westside Blvd. and Golf Course Rd. The site plan for subdivision proposes creation of a fourth tract (Tract F-1) and design standards that will apply to the site plan for building permit for Tract F-1 and to future development on this shopping center site. The site plan for building permit proposes a 475 unit self-storage facility with a caretaker residence on the newly created Tract F-1.

Though the request generally furthers the intent of the Comprehensive Plan and the West Side Strategic Plan, policy compliance is somewhat weak in certain instances. Staff has carefully compared the proposed site plan for building permit for the storage facility with the proposed design standards and has found some instances in which the former does not comply with the latter. Staff finds that, in general, the proposed design standards need some strengthening in order to create the cohesive, quality shopping center that the neighborhoods desire and that would be appropriate for this designated neighborhood activity center.

Staff has proposed conditions that will improve policy compliance and strengthen the design standards, in order to establish a framework that will create a quality development in the future. Staff recommends that delegation of future site plans for building permit to the DRB not be made at this time.

FINDINGS -06EPC 00424, September 21, 2006-Site Development Plan for Subdivision

1. This is a request for approval of a site development plan for subdivision (06EPC-00424) for Tracts A-1, B-1 and C-1 of the Black Arroyo Dam Addition, an approximately 15 acre site, zoned C-2 (SC).
2. The applicant proposes design standards for the shopping center and the creation of Tract F-1, upon which 475 storage units are proposed through the associated site plan for building permit request (06EPC-00425).
3. Self-storage units are a conditional use in the C-2 zone. The conditional use permit which will allow the storage units on Tract F-1 was indefinitely deferred due to access issues, which have since been resolved.
4. Though the Westside Development Traffic Impact Study (TIS) has been completed, it contains deficiencies which the applicant and the City Engineer will need to work together to address.
5. The request *further*s the following Comprehensive Plan policies:
 - A. Policy II.B.5a-Full range of urban land uses, because it will bring new commercial uses to the area.
 - B. Policy II.B.5e-programmed facilities/neighborhood integrity, because the use of existing services is unlikely to disrupt existing neighborhoods.
6. The request *partially further*s the following Comprehensive Plan policies:
 - A. Policy II.B.5i-Employment/service use location. Though the basin separates the development and existing residential areas, the design standards do not adequately address lighting and the effects of traffic are unknown.
 - B. Policy II.B.5j-Location of new commercial development. Though the subject site is commercially zoned, storage units undermine the intent of this policy because they are not the type of every day use envisioned for this neighborhood activity center.
 - C. Policy II.B.5l-Design quality/innovation. The metal storage units are a non-innovative utilitarian design, but the caretaker's residence is nicely designed.

7. The request *does not further* the following Comprehensive Plan policies:

A. Policy II.B.5d-Neighborhood values/natural environmental conditions. The neighbors desire a high quality development, but the proposed design standards do not ensure this.

B. Policy II.B.5m-site design/visual environment. The proposed storage units do not improve the quality of the visual environment and the design standards do not ensure a uniform architecture and theme.

8. Regarding the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP), the request *partially furthers* Policy 1.1. The subject site is located in a Neighborhood Center, but the design standards do not address bicycle and pedestrian connections and the storage units are not a “daily” use.

9. Regarding the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP), the request *does not further* the following policies:

A. Policies 1.15 and 1.16 (Neighborhood Centers). The storage units do not foster a “built scale very accommodating to pedestrians and bicyclists”. The site plan for subdivision does not adequately address how the shopping center will be connected to the neighborhoods.

B. Design guidelines-other views. The proposed development will adversely affect the view from the bluff for residents, park users and trail users. Visual elements, such as chain link fencing and high walls, will worsen views in the area.

10. The proposal *conflicts* with Sections 4(A)(2) and 4(A)(3) of the Westside-McMahon Land Use and Transportation Guide (Enactment 117-1999), which envisions neighborhood commercial uses (C-1) at this location. However, the Guide does not supersede the subject site’s existing C-2 zoning.

11. The proposed design standards need some strengthening in order to establish a framework that will create a cohesive, quality shopping center that will be appropriate for the Golf Course/County Line Neighborhood Activity Center.

12. Zoning Code §14-16-1-5 defines the elements that site plan for subdivision must contain. The proposed design standards do not address pedestrian and vehicular ingress and egress, internal circulation, maximum building height and minimum building setback.

13. The proposed design standards do not address pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation. The West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) intends that Neighborhood Centers have pedestrian and bicycle connections.

14. The proposed landscape standards include plants that are recognized high pollen producers and high water users. The use of such plants conflicts with the intent of the City's current emphasis on pollen control and water conservation through xeriscaping.

15. The proposed conditions of approval will improve policy compliance and strengthen the design standards.

16. There is some neighborhood concern. The Paradise Heights NA favors a cohesive development with a uniform style and pedestrian connections. Neighbors in the adjacent Horizon Hills subdivision are concerned about cohesiveness, quality and impact on the surrounding environment.

RECOMMENDATION - 06EPC 00424, September 21, 2006

APPROVAL of 06EPC 00424, a Site Development Plan for Subdivision for Tracts A-1, B-1 and C-1, Black Arroyo Dam Addition, based on the preceding Findings and subject to the following Conditions of approval.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL - 06EPC 00424, September 21, 2006-Site Development Plan for Subdivision

1. The EPC delegates final sign-off authority of this site development plan to the Development Review Board (DRB). The DRB is responsible for ensuring that all EPC Conditions have been satisfied and that other applicable City requirements have been met. A letter shall accompany the submittal, specifying all modifications that have been made to the site plan since the EPC hearing, including how the site plan has been modified to meet each of the EPC conditions. Unauthorized changes to this site plan, including before or after DRB final sign-off, may result in forfeiture of approvals.

2. Prior to final DRB sign off, the applicant shall meet with the Development Review staff planner to ensure that conditions of approval are thoroughly addressed. Evidence of this meeting shall be provided to the DRB at the time of application.

3. A note shall be added to the site plan for subdivision stating that development on Tracts A-1, B-1 and C-1, and any tracts resulting from a subsequent subdivision action, shall return to the EPC for review.
4. A note shall be added to the site plan for subdivision stating that the use for Tract F-1 is conditional. The zoning shall be indicated as C-2 (SC) for all tracts.
5. To comply with Zoning Code §14-16-1-5, the design standards shall address the following: vehicular ingress and egress, pedestrian ingress and egress, internal circulation, maximum building height and minimum building setback.
6. Standards for Screening, Walls & Fences:
 - A. The design standards shall include narrative regarding finishes, types of walls/fencing permitted and screening.
 - B. Barbed wire, concertina wire, chain link fencing and unfinished CMU block shall be prohibited.
7. Lighting Standards:
 - A. Light fixtures shall be fully shielded.
 - B. High-pressure sodium lighting and uplighting are prohibited.
 - C. Light pole height shall be measured from top to grade.
8. Standards for Pedestrian & Bicycle Access and Circulation:
 - A. Narrative shall be added to the design standards to address Pedestrian & Bicycle Access and Circulation.
 - B. Pedestrian connections shall be provided between Tracts A-1, B-1 and C-1 and any subsequently subdivided tracts in this shopping center.
 - C. Pedestrian connections of textured, colored concrete shall be provided between buildings and parking areas.
 - D. Restaurants shall provide outdoor seating.

9. Parking: Parking shall not exceed the required parking plus 10%.

10. Landscape Standards:

- A. The landscape standards shall list water usage and allergenic potential for all plant material.
- B. Varieties of juniper, a high pollen producer, shall not be included.
- C. Crabapple, Sycamore and Bradford Pear, high water use trees, shall not be included.
- D. Boxwood and Privet, high water users inappropriate for Albuquerque's climate, shall not be used as hedges. Hedges shall be of xeric plants such as Russian Sage or Big Sage (artemisia).
- E. Bluegrass and Fescues, high water use grasses, shall not be used in the shopping center except for a small turf area at a caretaker's residence.

11. The following plants shall be added to broaden the landscape palette:

- A. Desert Willow, Chinese Pistache, Rosemary, Mexican evening primrose, and Rocky Mountain Penstemon, which are used in the associated the site plan for building permit request (06EPC-00425).
- B. Additional xeric grasses (such as Threadgrass, blue gramma grass, blue fescue) and desert accent plants (such as hesperaloe, sotol, ocotillo).
- C. Additional Plants such as Lavender, Three-Leaf Sumac, Curlleaf Mountain Mahogany, Autumn Sage, Ferbush and Vitex.

12. Utility Standards: Rooftop utility equipment, mechanical equipment and transformers and telephone boxes viewed from the public right-of-way shall be screened.

13. Architecture & Design:

- A. Unmodified, non-southwestern franchise (signature) architecture shall be prohibited.
- B. The word "contemporary" shall be removed from "southwestern contemporary style".

14. Signage Standards:

- A. The structure holding the monument sign and the project sign shall be compatible with building architecture.
- B. Monument signs shall not exceed 20 sf of sign face area as shown in the monument sign detail.
- C. Building-mounted signage shall not exceed 8% of the façade to which it is applied.
- D. Pole-mounted signs and signs supported with wires shall be prohibited.
- E. No building mounted signage shall face a residential area.

15. The applicant will need to continue coordinating with the Albuquerque Metropolitan Arroyo Flood Control Authority (AMAFCA) and the City Hydrologist regarding the subject site's location in a Flood Zone.

FINDINGS -06EPC 00425, September 21, 2006-Site Development Plan for Building Permit

- 1. This is a request for approval of a site development plan for subdivision (06EPC-00424) for Tracts A-1, B-1 and C-1 of the Black Arroyo Dam Addition, an approximately 15 acre site, zoned C-2 (SC).
- 2. The applicant proposes to construct a 475 unit self-storage units on Tract F-1. Tract F-1 will be created through the associated site plan for subdivision request (06EPC-00424), which also contains design standards applicable to future development.
- 3. Self-storage units are a conditional use in the C-2 zone. The conditional use permit which will allow the storage units on Tract F-1 was indefinitely deferred due to access issues, which have since been resolved.
- 4. Though the Westside Development Traffic Impact Study (TIS) has been completed, it contains deficiencies which the applicant and the City Engineer will need to work together to address.

5. The request *further*s the following Comprehensive Plan policies:

A. Policy II.B.5a-Full range of urban land uses, because it will bring new commercial uses to the area.

B. Policy II.B.5e-programmed facilities/neighborhood integrity, because the use of existing services is unlikely to disrupt existing neighborhoods.

6. The request *partially further*s the following Comprehensive Plan policies:

A. Policy II.B.5i-Employment/service use location. Though the basin separates the development and existing residential areas, the design standards do not adequately address lighting and the effects of traffic are unknown.

B. Policy II.B.5j-Location of new commercial development. Though the subject site is commercially zoned, storage units undermine the intent of this policy because they are not the type of every day use envisioned for this neighborhood activity center.

C. Policy II.B.5l-Design quality/innovation. The metal storage units are a non-innovative utilitarian design, but the caretaker's residence is nicely designed.

7. The request *does not further* the following Comprehensive Plan policies:

A. Policy II.B.5d-Neighborhood values/natural environmental conditions. The neighbors desire a high quality development, but the proposed design standards do not ensure this.

B. Policy II.B.5m-site design/visual environment. The proposed storage units do not improve the quality of the visual environment and the design standards do not ensure a uniform architecture and theme.

8. Regarding the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP), the request *partially further*s Policy 1.1. The subject site is located in a Neighborhood Center, but the design standards do not address bicycle and pedestrian connections and the storage units are not a "daily" use.

9. Regarding the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP), the request *does not further* the following policies:
- A. Policies 1.15 and 1.16 (Neighborhood Centers). The storage units do not foster a “built scale very accommodating to pedestrians and bicyclists”. The site plan for subdivision does not adequately address how the shopping center will be connected to the neighborhoods.
 - B. Design guidelines-other views. The proposed development will adversely affect the view from the bluff for residents, park users and trail users. Visual elements, such as chain link fencing and high walls, will worsen views in the area.
10. The request *conflicts* with Sections 4(A)(2) and 4(A)(3) of the Westside-McMahon Land Use and Transportation Guide (Enactment 117-1999), which envisions neighborhood commercial uses (C-1) at this location. However, the Guide does not supersede the subject site’s existing C-2 zoning.
11. The proposed conditions of approval will improve policy compliance and ensure that the site development plan for building permit complies with the design standards in the site development plan for subdivision.
12. There is some neighborhood concern. The Paradise Heights NA favors a cohesive development with a uniform style and pedestrian connections. Neighbors in the adjacent Horizon Hills subdivision are concerned about cohesiveness, quality and impact on the surrounding environment.

RECOMMENDATION - 06EPC 00425, September 21, 2006

APPROVAL of 06EPC 00425, a Site Development Plan for Building Permit for Tract F-1, Black Arroyo Dam Addition, based on the preceding Findings and subject to the following Conditions of approval.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL - 06EPC 00425, September 21, 2006-Site Development Plan for Building Permit

1. The EPC delegates final sign-off authority of this site development plan to the Development Review Board (DRB). The DRB is responsible for ensuring that all EPC Conditions have been satisfied and that other applicable City requirements have been met. A letter shall accompany the submittal, specifying all modifications that have been made to the site plan since the EPC hearing, including how the site plan

has been modified to meet each of the EPC conditions. Unauthorized changes to this site plan, including before or after DRB final sign-off, may result in forfeiture of approvals.

2. Prior to final DRB sign off, the applicant shall meet with the Development Review staff planner to ensure that conditions of approval are thoroughly addressed. Evidence of this meeting shall be provided to the DRB at the time of application.

3. A note shall be added to the site plan note to explain the intentions for the Phase II future development.

4. Walls & Fences

- A. The height and material of the refuse enclosure walls shall be indicated.
- B. Pilasters, every 20 ft., shall be added to the wall to improve its quality and lessen the fortress feeling.
- C. The patio fence around the caretaker's yard shall be made of wood, wood substitute or CMU block, in a light tan or brown color.
- D. The chain link fence shall be replaced with a tan, painted steel fence that blends with its surroundings.
- E. The steel fence shall extend to the building and stop, and the building can be used as a boundary-leaving the 6 ft. drainage channel free and using less fencing.

5. Lighting:

- A. The location of the proposed light poles shall be indicated on the site plan.
- B. A lighting detail shall be provided.

6. Pedestrian & Bicycle Access and Circulation: The site plan shall include a note explaining that, because of the use's nature and location, pedestrian and bicycle access is less important for Tract F-1 than for the remaining (and any future) tracts.

7. Parking:

- A. Parking calculations shall be included on the site plan.
- B. A note shall be added explaining that motorcycle or bicycle parking is not included.

8. Landscape

- A. Kentucky Bluegrass shall be replaced with a turf blend that uses less water and complies with the associated site plan for subdivision request (06EPC-00424).
- B. Landscape coverage is not 75% on the areas near the entrance. Additional plant material is needed.

9. Signage:

- A. To comply with the site plan for subdivision, the freestanding sign near the entrance shall be replaced by a monument sign.
- B. To comply with the site plan for subdivision, the monument sign shall not exceed 20 sf of sign face area.

10. The subject site is located in a Flood Zone. The applicant will need to continue coordinating with the Albuquerque Metropolitan Arroyo Flood Control Authority (AMAFCA) and the City Hydrologist regarding stormwater runoff, which will be addressed at the Development Review Board (DRB).

11. RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS FROM THE ALBUQUERQUE METROPOLITAN ARROYO FLOOD CONTROL AUTHORITY (AMAFCA):

- A. The final Grading & Drainage Plan will be approved by AMAFCA prior to release of building permit.
- B. The storm drain connection to the Black Arroyo Channel will require a private storm drain license approved by the AMAFCA Board of Directors.
- C. The upstream sediment basins are in a FEMA floodplain and may not be allowed by the City Floodplain Administrator.

**12. RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS FROM CITY ENGINEER, MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT,
WATER AUTHORITY and NMDOT:**

Conditions of approval for the proposed Site Development Plan for Subdivision and Site Development Plan for Building Permit shall include:

Deferral, until the required Traffic Impact Study is submitted and reviewed by staff and access to Westside Boulevard is approved by the TCC of the MRCOG.

***Catalina Lehner, AICP
Planner***

cc: Donald Harville, Calabacillas Group, 8200 Constitution Place NE, Albuquerque, NM 87110
John Youngblood, Calabacillas Group, 2910-B Girard NE, Albuquerque, NM 87107
H. Barker Architects, 209 Gold Ave. SW, Albuquerque, NM 87102
Jerome Romero, Paradise Heights NA, 10601 Olympic St. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114
Rene Stapf, Paradise Heights NA, 10524 Espira Ct. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114
Robin Mintz, 10,524 Ridgetop Ct. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114
Mike Mirabal, Stonebridge HOA, 10,951 Carreta Dr. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114

AGENCY COMMENTS

➤ **The following agencies did not review or comment on Project #1004976:**

City of Albuquerque

Environmental Health, Air Quality Division
Environmental Health, Env. Services Division
Fire Department, Planning
Parks & Recreation, Open Space Division

Other

Bernalillo County
Middle Rio Grande Conservancy Dist. (MRGCD)
Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG)
Police Department/Planning

➤ **The following City of Albuquerque Departments and Divisions reviewed and commented on Project #1004976:**

Planning, Zoning Code Services

The proposed activity requires conditional use approval. Conditional use approval has not been granted.

Planning, Office of Neighborhood Coordination

Paradise Heights Neigh. Assoc. (R)

6/5/06 – Agent (H.Barker) will need to request a new ONC Letter to ONC – ONC letter is outdated (expired on 4/29/06) – siw

6/9/06 – Agent (H. Barker) came into ONC to get updated letter – siw

Parks & Recreation, Planning & Design

Reviewed, no objection. Request does not affect our facilities.

Solid Waste Management Dept., Refuse Division

Disapproved, identify refuse enclosure location on site plan, and show driver access. Call for details, (761-8142).

Transit Department

Adjacent and nearby routes	None. The #158 Golf Course / Coors all-day route and the #92 Taylor Ranch Express commuter route pass about ¾ mile to the south at Golf Course and Ellison.
Adjacent bus stops	None.
Site plan requirements	None.
Large site TDM suggestions	N/A
Other information	None.

City of Albuquerque Public Works Department

Transportation Development (City Engineer/Planning Department):

- Deferral, until the required Traffic Impact Study is submitted and reviewed by staff and access to Westside Boulevard is approved by the TCC of the MRCOG.

Hydrology Development (City Engineer/Planning Department):

- An approved conceptual grading and drainage plan is required for site plan sign-off by the City Engineer.
- Condition: Platting must be a concurrent DRB action.

Transportation Planning (Department of Municipal Development):

Findings

- Westside Boulevard is a limited access principal arterial with a *minimum* right-of-way of 156 feet as designated on Long Range Roadway System map.
- The access policy for Westside Boulevard currently *does not* permit access along the south side of Westside Boulevard adjacent to the development.
- Exceptions to the access policy to allow for the proposed driveway to Westside Boulevard will require the approval of the Transportation Coordinating Committee (TCC) of the Mid-Region Council of Governments consistent with procedures described in R-05-09.
- Westside Boulevard is proposed to contain on-street bicycle lanes as designated on the Long Range Bikeway System map and more specifically described in the approved Environmental Assessment for the Westside-McMahon Transportation Corridor.

Conditions

- Dedication of a *minimum* 78 feet of right-of-way from the centerline of Westside Boulevard a limited access principal arterial as designated on the Long Range Roadway System map.
- Approval of the proposed driveway to Westside Boulevard by the Transportation Coordinating Committee (TCC) of the Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG) consistent with procedures described in MRCOG resolution R-05-09.
- Construction of an on-street bicycle lane along Westside Boulevard adjacent to the development as designated on Long Range Bikeways System.

Traffic Engineering Operations (Department of Municipal Development):

- No comments received.

Street Maintenance (Department of Municipal Development):

- No comments received.

Utility Development (Water Authority):

- The project site is located within an area served by New Mexico Utilities. Water and sanitary sewer services will depend on their system capabilities. This includes fire protection as well as metered water and sanitary sewer services. Fire flow requirements and fire hydrant placement locations must be verified through the Fire Marshal's office and system capacity verified through NMUI prior to the issuance of any building permits.

Water Resources, Water Utilities and Wastewater Utilities (Water Authority):

- No comments received.

New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT):

- TIA required.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS FROM CITY ENGINEER, MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT,
WATER AUTHORITY and NMDOT:

Conditions of approval for the proposed Site Development Plan for Subdivision and Site Development Plan for Building Permit shall include:

- a. Deferral, until the required Traffic Impact Study is submitted and reviewed by staff and access to Westside Boulevard is approved by the TCC of the MRCOG.

➤ **The following agencies reviewed and commented on Project #1004976:**

Albuquerque Public Schools (APS)

The request for a site plan approval for a building permit for a self-storage facility will have no adverse impacts to the APS district.

Abq. Metro Arroyo Flood Control Authority (AMAFCA)

1. The final Grading & Drainage Plan will be approved by AMAFCA prior to release of building permit.
2. The storm drain connection to the Black Arroyo Channel will require a private storm drain license approved by the AMAFCA Board of Directors.
3. The upstream sediment basins are in a FEMA floodplain and may not be allowed by the City Floodplain Administrator.

Public Service Company of New Mexico

No comment based on the information provided to date. It is the applicant's obligation to determine and accommodate existing utility easements that cross the property, to dedicate utility easements, and to abide by any conditions or terms of such easements.